# City of Las Vegas

## **AGENDA MEMO**

CITY COUNCIL MEETING DATE: JUNE 20, 2007 DEPARTMENT: PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

ITEM DESCRIPTION: VAR-20816 - OWNER/APPLICANT: SCHIFINI FAMILY TRUST

# \*\* CONDITIONS \*\*

Staff recommends DENIAL. The Planning Commission (5-1/rt vote) recommends APPROVAL, subject to:

#### Planning and Development

- 1. Conformance to the conditions for Rezoning (Z-20-97), and Site Development Plan Review (SDR-20812) and Variance (VAR-21609) if approved.
- 2. This approval shall be void two years from the date of final approval, unless a certificate of occupancy has been issued or upon approval of a final inspection. An Extension of Time may be filed for consideration by the City of Las Vegas.

## \*\* STAFF REPORT \*\*

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This application is a request for a Variance to allow a three story, 50 foot tall building where a two story, 35 foot tall building is allowed within the Las Vegas Medical District, on property located on the southwest corner of Pinto Lane and Tonopah Drive, . The first level will be used for covered parking. The second and third stories will be used for office space with a combined floor space of 15,000 square feet.

#### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Related Relevant City Actions by P&D, Fire, Bldg., etc.					
Month/date/year	Action				
	The City Council approved a Rezone (Z-0020-97) application, rezoning the				
05/27/97	Las Vegas Medical District to PD (Planned Development).				
	The City Council approved a Major Modification [Z-0020-97(33)] to the Las				
	Vegas Medical District Neighborhood Plan to update and revise the plan				
06/19/02	document.				
	The Planning Commission recommended approval of companion items				
	VAR-21609 and SDR-20812 concurrently with this application.				
0 - 1 - 1 10 -	The Planning Commission voted 5-1/rt to recommend APPROVAL (PC				
05/24/07	Agenda Item #37/lhm).				
Pre-Application 1	8				
	At the pre-application conference, issues were discussed relative to residential				
	adjacency requirements, parking requirements for medical uses, and general				
	development standards in the Las Vegas Medical District. In addition, the				
02/05/07	streetscape standards for Pinto Lane and Rose Street were discussed with the				
02/05/07	applicant.				
Neighborhood M	6				
37/4	A neighborhood meeting is not required as part of this application request, nor				
N/A	was one held.				
Field Check					
04/04/2007	Undeveloped lot in Las Vegas Medical District area; Office next door,				
	residential in back. Three story building being built, on the east side of Pinto				
	Lane, south of the subject site.				

Details of Application Request		
Site Area		
Net Acres	0.7	

<b>Surrounding Property</b>	<b>Existing Land Use</b>	Planned Land Use	<b>Existing Zoning</b>
		PD (Planned	P-O (Professional
Subject Property	Undeveloped	Development)	Office)
			MD-1 (Medical
		PD (Planned	Support)
North	Pinto Lane/Offices	Development)	
		PD (Planned	P-O (Professional
South	Medical Office	Development)	Office)
		PD (Planned	P-O (Professional
East	Residential	Development)	Office)
		PD (Planned	P-O (Professional
West	Residential	Development)	Office)

Special Districts/Zones	Yes	No	Compliance
Special Area Plan			
Las Vegas Medical District	X		N
Special Districts/Zones	Yes	No	Compliance
Special Purpose and Overlay Districts			
A-O Airport Overlay District	X		Y
Trails		X	N/A
Rural Preservation Overlay District		X	N/A
<b>Development Impact Notification Assessment</b>		X	N/A
Project of Regional Significance		X	N/A

## Las Vegas Medical District

The parcel is located within the Las Vegas Medical District, which is intended to provide for future and continued development in this area of an interrelated and cohesive mix of uses in a manner that is safe, orderly, and manageable for pedestrians.

#### **Airport Overlay District**

The parcel is located within the boundaries of the Airport Overlay District; any structure over 175 feet in height requires the submittal of a Special Use Permit application. As the structure is less than the specified height, no Special Use Permit application is necessary.

## **DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS**

Las Vegas Medical District Plan

Standard	Required/Allowed	Provided	Compliance
Min. Lot Size	N/A	0.7 acres	Y
		157.37	
Min. Lot Width	Existing	feet	Y
Min. Setbacks			
• Front	5 – 15 Feet	15 Feet	
• Side	10 Feet	70 Feet	Y
• Corner	15 Feet	15 Feet	Y
• Rear	153 Feet**	82'3"	N
Max. Lot Coverage	50%	40%	Y
Max. Building Height	2 Stories (35 Feet)	50 Feet	N
Trash Enclosure	N/A		N/A

<sup>\*\*</sup>Rear setback of building does not meet residential adjacency standards.

Pursuant to Title 19.10, the following parking standards apply:

Parking Requirement							
<u> </u>	Gross	Required		Provided		Compliance	
	Floor Area			Parking			
	or Number	Parking		Handi-		Handi-	
Use	of Units	Ratio	Regular	capped	Regular	capped	
Office	7,500 sf	1/300	25	3	25	3	Y
		1/200 sf					
		of gfa					
		up to					
		2000 sf					
		plus 1					
		for each					
		addl 175					
Medical Office	7,500 sf	sf.	38		47		Y
SubTotal			63		72		Y
TOTAL							
(including							
handicap)					72		Y

#### **ANALYSIS**

The applicant is proposing to construct a 15,000 square-foot three-story general office and medical office building on the north east corner of the parcel. Access to the site will be from driveways located on Pinto Lane and Tonopah Drive. Parking for the structure is located on the south and west side of the building and on the ground floor of the proposed building. A total of 72 parking spaces will be provided.

Due to the size of the parcel the proposed building is designed at a height of 50 feet where 35 feet is the maximum height allowed in the PO (Professional Office) land use designation, as stated in the Las Vegas Medical District Development Standards. The applicant cites a three story building was needed in order to provide the required number of parking spaces for the 15,000 square foot building. Twenty-four of the 72 parking spaces will be located on the ground floor of the building. Non-medical office and medical office space will be on floors two and three.

The applicant cites parcel size as the reason for the Variance request, which is contrary to the listed criteria for whether or not a Variance is warranted. Staff recommends denial.

#### **FINDINGS**

In accordance with the provisions of Title 19.18.070(B), Planning Commission and City Council, in considering the merits of a Variance request, shall not grant a Variance in order to:

- 1. Permit a use in a zoning district in which the use is not allowed;
- 2. Vary any minimum spacing requirement between uses;
- 3. Relieve a hardship which is solely personal, self-created or financial in nature."

#### Additionally, Title 19.18.070L states:

"Where by reason of exceptional narrowness, shallowness, or shape of a specific piece of property at the time of enactment of the regulation, or by reason of exceptional topographic conditions or other extraordinary and exceptional situation or condition of the piece of property, the strict application of any zoning regulation would result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties to, or exceptional and undue hardships upon, the owner of the property, a variance from that strict application may be granted so as to relieve the difficulties or hardship, if the relief may be granted without substantial detriment to the public good, without substantial impairment of affected natural resources and without substantially impairing the intent and purpose of any ordinance or resolution."

VAR-20816 - Staff Report Page Five June 20, 2007, City Council Meeting

No evidence of a unique or extraordinary circumstance has been presented, in that the applicant has created a self-imposed hardship by overbuilding the site. Alternative is to design a smaller building on the site which would allow conformance to the Title 19 requirements. In view of the absence of any hardships imposed by the site's physical characteristics, it is concluded that the applicant's hardship is preferential in nature, and it is thereby outside the realm of NRS Chapter 278 for granting of Variances.

16

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSO	<u>CIATIO</u>	NS NOTIFIED
ASSEMBLY DISTRICT	6	
SENATE DISTRICT	3	
NOTICES MAILED	123	by City Clerk
<u>APPROVALS</u>	0	
PROTESTS	0	